REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5 and 10-13 are pending in this application. An amendment is proposed herein canceling claims 5, 10 and 11 without prejudice or disclaimer, and amending claims 1, 3 and 4.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 12 and 13 will be pending.

The Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated **August 8, 2006**.

Support for the amendments to the claims may be found on page 10, last paragraph, to page 11, line 3, of the specification.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Linthicum, of record. (Office action page 2)

Claims 1, 4, 5, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Arai '039. (Office action page 2)

Claims 1, 3-5 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai with Sawaki and Linthicum, of record. (Office action page 2)

Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the proposed amendments to the claims.

The Examiner stated in the Office action that the recitation "for an electronic-optical united device" represents only a statement of intended use. The claims have been amended to recite that

the substrate is a component of an electronic-optical device, and to clarify that the electronic device

is a device such as an LSI and that the optical device is a device such as an LED or a laser diode.

To further clarify the structure recited in the claim, both the "one area" and "another area" are recited

to be "formed with the electronic device."

Applicant again submits that Linthicum does not disclose that both electronic devices such

as LSIs and optical devices such as LEDs and laser diodes are formed in one and the same substrate.

In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the monocrystalline silicon substrate is

an SOI substrate. Because an SOI substrate is used as a monocrystalline silicon substrate, the

substrate itself is advantageously low in parasitic capacity, which will reduce malfunction of the

devices incorporated in the substrate, improving the stability of operation. Furthermore, the

invention contributes to the enhanced performance of the incorporated devices because of the

substantial reduction in the amount of noise entering into the signal line between the electronic

device and the optical device and because of shortening of the signal line. Applicant submits that

the represents an unexpected advantage over cited references.

Again, reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned agent at the telephone number

indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

-5-

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/699,832 Amendment filed December 8, 2006 Reply to OA dated August 8, 2006

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,

HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

Daniel A. Geselowitz, Ph.D.

Agent for Applicant Reg. No. 42,573

DAG/bh Atty. Docket No. **031258** Suite 1000 1725 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 659-2930

23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Q:\FLOATERS\BRENDA\031 Cases\031258 Amendment in re FOA of 08-08-06